DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 355 990 JC 930 171

AUTHOR	Martorana, S. V.
TITLE	Upper-Division Collegiate Offerings on Community College Campuses: A Preliminary Report to the National Council of State Directors of Community & Junior Colleges.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Council of State Directors of Community-Junior Colleges.
PUB DATE	Apr 93
NOTE	10p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; *Advanced Courses; Articulation (Education); *Community Colleges; Curriculum Development; Educational Administration; *Educational Planning; Educational Policy; Institutional Cooperation; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; National Surveys; Program Content; Research Design; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted of state-level administrators of community colleges to examine the practice of baccalaureate degree-granting colleges and universities offering courses and programs of upper-division collegiate credit at community colleges. A two-part, open-ended question was developed to determine the level of practice and the extent of interest raised by the issue as well as whether or not there was a stated policy bearing on the activity. The survey was circulated to the community college directors of each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, the Northern Marianas, and Guam as part of an annual call for information on actions of the legislatures regarding community colleges. Usable responses were received from 33 states. This preliminary report of the findings indicates that for 13 states, the majority of respondents, there exists some practice but no relevant policy. Six states had notable practice and some policy. Five states had neither upper-division courses offered at community colleges nor any relevant policy. Both Florida and Hawaii have high rates of practice, though Hawaii has a stronger policy on the issue. North Carolina was unique in that it had no practice and a strong policy against the practice. Three locations stand out for their use of the community college as a pivotal place for offering upper-division programs by four-year institutions: Rochester, Minnesota, in connection with the Rochester University Center; McComb, Michigan, where McComb Community College provides housing for upper-level institutions; and Bend, Oregon, where Central Oregon Community College utilizes a consortium approach to offering upper-division credit. (MAB)

ED355990

Upper-Division Collegiate Offerings on Community College Campuses

A Preliminary Report to the National Council of State Directors of Community & Junior Colleges

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Mortimer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

S. V. Martorana
Professor Emeritus
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University
403 South Allen Street, Suite 104
University Park, PA 16801-5252

April 1993

JC930171

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction & Background

How best to place community college education in the structure of the total American postsecondary educational system is a question asked of the "movement" to establish and strengthen institutions that provide that education since its inception. Some American education analysts have claimed a firm location for community colleges within the total structure, basing their argument primarily upon concepts of differentiation of mission, students served, and approaches to instruction and curriculum development; they see these considerations as most critical in determining the proper place of community college education within the total American system.

The fact of the matter, however, is that the institutions that collectively comprise "community based" postsecondary education in America (comprehensive community colleges, junior colleges, 2-year technical colleges, branch campuses of baccalaureate and higher degree granting colleges and universities, proprietary technical and trade schools) have evolved to a place in the total post-high school system rather than put there by design. These institutions as an aggregation are increasingly being termed generically "community colleges" as evidenced by the recent decision of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, formerly named the American Association of Junior Colleges, to drop the term "junior" from its title. The place that these institutions have made for themselves within the total system has come largely from slow shifts in how they actively operate and what happens at their locations. Even the states that formulated statewide plans for establishing public community and junior colleges accommodated the prior evolution of two-year colleges in the particular state when the plans were first formulated, and in state

after state there have been continuing amendments to state plans to recognize the reality of changes taking place in the field.

State Director Interest

This is a preliminary report of the results of a survey done for the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges, examining a practice that bears on the issue of community college mission and place in the structure of postsecondary education in the United States, namely the practice of baccalaureate degree-granting colleges and universities offering courses and programs of upper-division collegiate credit on the campus sites of community colleges. The survey question was circulated to the state directors as a part of the regular call for information on actions of the legislatures pertaining to community college education which as a standard practice asks the directors also to react to an issue of interest to them and believed to have implication for public policy and possible legislative attention. The question posed in the call for material on the 1990 sessions asked about upper-level offerings on community college sites. This report is built from the responses received and follow-up communications to them. This preliminary report will be expanded and updated to be a major section of the next report on state legislation affecting community colleges now being directed by colleagues Peter H. Garland and Robert M. Hendrickson at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at The Pennsylvania State University.

Procedure

The call for materials reporting action by legislatures is addressed each year to the official responsible for state-level administration of community colleges (by whatever titular

designation of institution is used in the particular jurisdiction) in each of the fifty states as well as the District of Columbia, Guam, Northern Marianas, and Puerto Rico. The accompanying policy issue on which we ask these officials to comment is presented in the same letter as that calling for information on legislation. It is an open-ended question to which an initial unstructured response can be given. More detailed information pertinent to the issue is then obtained from respondents whose initial reply indicates such action by follow-up correspondence and telephone conversation.

The question basic to this preliminary report stated simply that an interest had been expressed among the state directors for more factual knowledge about the extent to which four-year colleges and universities offered courses and programs for which upper-division (junior and senior) academic credit toward a degree was awarded. Respondents were asked to comment on: (1) whether or not the practice had attracted particular notice as a policy issue; and (2) whether or not there was a stated policy bearing upon the practice. Based on their replies follow-up telephone calls and correspondence occurred to gather more detailed information to assist in the analysis described in this report.

The question was put in two parts, one to establish the level of the practice and the other to identify the existence of relevant policy position, on the assumption that state director interest stemmed from the implications for policy development when the level of or interest in the practice became high enough to warrant it. In examining the information obtained, therefore, a four-by-three matrix was developed which would show the relationship of the level of the practice to the presence and strength of relevant policy. Practice, as described by the resources available, was categorized as "None, "Some,"

"Notable," and "High" and relevant policy was categorized as "None," "Some," and "Strong."

Note should be taken that such classifications at this stage of examination of the question are necessarily quite subjective and must be viewed as "subject to change." This is for two reasons: first, because the information has been compiled in anecdotal fashion as seen and reported by persons in official places and in position to know conditions in a particular jurisdiction but who were not called upon or expected to probe deeply into the matter in responding. Thus, the perceptions they reported of the degree and nature of development of the practice and relevant policy may not mirror exactly what actually obtains; and second, because the categorization of responses received as augmented by information from telephone calls and, in some cases, documentary material provided by respondents, was made by the presenter of this report, and, again, must be seen as an initial action and related conclusions open to improvement and refinement.

For purposes of this report, the working definitions of the four levels of practice are:

- None--self evident;
- Some--existence of an awareness of the practice of some place(s) and way(s) but viewed as not significant in attracting notice either in terms of frequency or the nature of the approach to the practice;
- Notable--a view that the practice is attracting specific notice either because of frequency of occurrence or the nature of the approach to it;
- High--practice is clearly recognized and active in frequency as well as attracting notice by virtue of approach.

Similarly, the working definitions of the three categories of relevant policy are:

- None--self evident;

- Some--evidence of an awareness of tangential or indirect policy that can be related to the practice by interpretation;
- Strong--indication of a clear-cut and direct policy framework applicable to the practice.

Results

The jurisdictions asked to reply and the ones from which usable information had been obtained at the time of this report are shown in Table 1. Usable information was obtained from 33 states; 17 have not replied to the question. Also, no replies were received from the District of Columbia, Guam, Northern Marianas, and Puerto Rico.

The results of the cross-classification of levels of practice and presence of relevant policy are shown in Table 2. Five states fall in the category of no practice and no policy. By far the largest group of states (13) falls in the category of some practice but no relevant policy. The next largest group (6) evidence notable practice and some policy. One state, Florida, is classified as exhibiting high practice and some policy and another (North Carolina) is seen as having no practice and a strong relevant policy--one that discourages the practice. Indications are that Hawaii which is classified as having some policy and a notable level of the practice will move to a classification of high practice and strong policy because of an increasing favorable view of the use of community colleges within the University of Hawaii system of institutions as outreach centers for upper-level as well as lower-division academic opportunity.

Among the places that are attracting notice by virtue to the approaches applied to the practice, with consequent amplification of possible policy implications are Rochester, Minnesota; McComb, Michigan; and Bend, Oregon. In each of these locations, the

community college has become a pivotal place for offerings of upper-division programs by four-year institutions. Rochester Community College is the hub of the Rochester University Center; McComb Community College provides housing built by the community college district specifically for upper-level institutions to use; and Central Oregon Community College is using a consortium approach to bring upper-division academic opportunity to its area.

Conclusion

These, other notable cases applicable to the question, and a more complete discussion of the policy implications for state director consideration will be presented in our next full report on state legislation. Now, we would appreciate a critical review of this preliminary report. Directors that have not yet provided information are asked to bring us up-to-date. All are encouraged to sharpen the classification design advanced in Table 2 and **especially to comment on the accuracy of the state's placement in the matrix described**. Please feel free, also, to help us gauge the importance of this subject, not only for policy planning and direction in your setting, but for the future growth and development of community college education as a whole.

TABLE 1
Jurisdictions Responding to Policy Question Concerning
Upper-division Collegiate Offerings at Community College Sites

Jurisdiction	Answer	No Answer
Alabama	X	
Alaska		X
Arkansas	X	
Arizona	X	
California	X	
Colorado		X
Connecticut	X	
Delaware		X
Florida	X	
Georgia		X
Hawaii	X	
Idaho	X	
Illinois	X	
Indiana	X	
Iowa	X	
Kansas	X	
Kentucky		X
Louisiana		X
Maine		X
Maryland	X	
Massachusetts	X	
Michigan	X	
Minnesota	X	
Mississippi	X	
Missouri	X	
Montana		X
Nebraska		X
Nevada	X	
New Hampshire	X	
New Jersey	X	
New Mexico		X
New York	X	
North Carolina	X	
North Dakota		X
Ohio	X	
Oklahoma	X	
Oregon	X	
Pennsylvania	X	
Rhode Island	X	
South Carolina		X
South Dakota		X
Tennessee		X
Texas	X	
Utah	X	
Vermont		X
Virginia		X
Washington	X	
West Virginia	X	
Wisconsin	X	
Wyoming		X
D.C.		X
Virgin Islands		X
Puerto Rico		X
Northern Marianas		X
Guam		X
TOTALS	33	22

TABLE 2

Distribution of 33 States of Relationship of Practice and Policy Concerning Offerings for Upper-division Credit by Baccalaureate Degree-granting Institutions at Community College Sites*

Classification of: Policy	Practice	States	Number
None	None	Alabama, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Wisconsin	5
None	Some	Arkansas, Arizona, California, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Mississippi, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma, Utah, Washington	13
None	Notable	Michigan, New Jersey, Oregon, Texas	4
Some	Some	Connecticut, New Hampshire	2
Some	Notable	Hawaii**, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Missouri	6
Some	High	Florida	1
Strong	None	North Carolina	1

* West Virginia is not classifiable because two-year colleges are integrally related to baccalaureate degree-granting institutions.

** Hawaii is a special case because all community colleges are integral units of the University of Hawaii.